

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 1. No. 13

2th Dec. 1921

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address: Hugo Eberlein, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

Important Notice.

The English edition of the "International Press Correspondence" is sent free of charge to all labour and communist organs in England, America, India, South Africa, Australia and Canada. The editors urgently request that the articles be reprinted in the labour and communist press with the least possible delay. The object of the "Correspondence" is to supply the organs of the working class movements in these countries with reliable information and with points of view which are not found in the capitalist press and news agencies.

It is particularly requested that all editors: 1. print as much of the contents of the "International Press Correspondence" as possible; 2. send exchange copies of their respective newspapers and journals to the editors of the "International Press Correspondence"; 3. offer advice and criticism about the "Correspondence", and suggest articles on subjects which may be of special interest to their respective countries. The editors set themselves the task of acting as a means of information and a connecting link between the various branches of the international labour movement. All letters, requests and enquiries received will obtain immediate attention. Members of labour and communist parties are also requested to send the editors of the "International Press Correspondence" the names and addresses of all their organs, so that copies can be sent to them.

POLITICS

The Fascisti Congress and the Strike in Rome.

by Umberto Terracini.

Many people entertained the illusion that the Fascisti movement which expressed itself for and against certain political tendencies in national and international affairs, hid some fundamental substance and a theoretical program under the theatrical savageness of its acts. This belief was sadly shaken in the few days in which the First National Congress of the Fascisti took place in the Augusteum Theater in Rome.

The Fascisti movement was designated by benevolent critics as "a state of mind", which was to crystallize into a respectable and concrete political organism as soon as the crisis would be overcome and as soon as the confusion caused by its arising at a time when a bitter social struggle was going on, was over.

This movement, however, proved to be nothing more than the "state of violence" of the capitalist class, not to be distinguished from the existing capitalist parties, and having no distinctive features of its own; a "state of violence", which was

created for the defense of the main supports of the ruling class against the threatening advance of the proletariat. Next, it became active in a rash undertaking which had for its purpose the destruction of the workers' strongest positions. At present it is continuing its activities in order to stop the reaction of the workers against their untold misery.

The main object of the Fascisti Congress was the founding of a Fascisti Party. Its forces, which until to-day have not undergone any political discipline, and which served in the interest of various contradictory political doctrines, and drifted with and that capitalistic current, were to be united into a sound organism.

The leaders of the movement, with Mussolini, its founder, at their head, wished to free Fascism from all parties, to make it independent of them, and to separate it from the coalition of all capitalist parties, which was formed in the last parliamentary elections in May, 1921.

In reality however, the Fascisti movement, especially its Parliamentary group, finds itself at present in a very strange and most untenable position. In it were to be found politicians of all parties, who were tied to the organizations they came from: Liberals, Radicals, Republicans, Democrats, Nationalists, Ex-soldiers. The constitution of the first parliamentary group offered the curious spectacle of the peculiar migrations on the part of the delegates, who wandered from one side of the chamber to the other, giving rise to uproarious incidents, and threatening to cause the dissolution of the group in absurdity. Among others, I note the incident which took place when Mussolini sounded a Republican note in the Fascisti movement. The numerous monarchists who are fighting in the ranks of the Fascisti were fired with indignation against this tendency.

Besides, the leaders felt that the life of the movement had to be defended against its growing degeneration into a mere instrument of violence in the service of the bourgeoisie. The movement thus threatened no longer to serve in the general interest of the bourgeoisie, but to subordinate itself through local and provincial agreements, as the case required.

To transform the Fascisti organizations from a league of military bands into a party with a program and tactics, would have meant to lend it serious content and give it aims which might prevent its threatening degeneration and save it from this danger to its existence.

But that was impossible, because the Fascisti movement is nothing more than a special defensive weapon of the bourgeoisie in the present period of embittered class-struggle.

The Congress at Rome actually proved that Fascism might perhaps become a strong and mighty force, capable and powerful enough to influence the course of events in Italy.

However, it is absolutely unable to change its content or its way of acting. It will never have the state-organs as the foundations for its activities. Its activities in Parliament, in the State-Council, and in the cabinet, will in no way distinguish themselves from the normal and traditional activities of the capitalist-conservative parties. At the very most, it can only become the political arena for some new personalities. But the condition for its existence is that it remains the leader of open illegal armed conflict upon the streets and upon the fields, and that it be the historically-created instrument of violence for the capitalist interests.

The Fascisti movement is strong; for, in its storm-troops are to be found thousands of men who have had a military

training, who are well armed, and who are safe from prosecution. After a year of crime they remain untouched. The movement is strong because of its numbers and because of the powerful means at its disposal; and not because of its consciousness, nor because of its political and philosophical convictions.

This is so true and is so well understood by the leaders that the entire preparation for the Congress at Rome was not based upon a fruitful discussion, (this was of a catastrophic emptiness and spiritlessness) but upon the best possible success of the parade which marked the completion of the Congress' work. It was the intention of its originators to have this event influence the political life of Italy. It was to serve not only as a proof of the bold and wise program that was formed, not only as a sharp criticism against the present situation and the inability of the other parties to overcome it, nor was it to furnish any historical or theoretical background to the bitter struggles carried on until now against the proletariat. No! it was the display of 40,000 armed men, drawn up in military formation, bloodthirsty, mad, and ready to perpetrate any crime. This military parade was to resound in all the provinces, and make the Italians feel that there was a force in Italy, which ruled and commanded, and which was to be counted with and obeyed.

It is interesting to note that the Government which is made up of Liberals, Democrats, members of the clerical "People's Party" and of reformist Socialists, did everything to encourage the concentration of uniformed and armed storm-troops in Rome, where they were to be seen with banners and standards, with names and symbolical inscriptions such as "The Desperate", "The Terrible", etc.

All of the capitalist parties had an interest in the "Power Display" of the Fascisti movement which is the apex of all their actions against the proletariat. They facilitated its impressive Congress because they felt assured that the Fascisti movement would remain unchanged in their service and that it would act in the same manner after the Congress as before it.

The work done by the Congress was a series of rowdyisms. At every moment the theater resounded with that war-cry with which the down-trodden provinces of Central Italy and the Po became acquainted in a tragic manner.

The platform was the stage where the scenes changed from the most idiotic proclamations to the most insane motions. Odd questions of a personal and moral nature such as the embezzlement of funds by some Fascisti leaders became principal questions and took up the greater part of the session. These were interrupted by provocative and challenging mass demonstrations which were made through the city streets.

The personality of Mussolini, whom the Fascisti proclaimed as their "Army leader", dominated the entire Congress, and his speech was the main attraction.

It is impossible to give even the slightest idea of this speech, because it lacked all logical coherence. According to the speaker, it was to start with the complete degeneration of all the capitalist and labor parties, show their emptiness and incapability of constructing a new and comprehensive political program, and then to shift to a presentation of evidence and a defense of the requirements of the new historical era upon which the Fascisti Party with its 300,000 followers are basing their claim for power.

Criticism was not lacking. Mussolini dwelt lengthily upon the Communist Party, and made the assertion that Fascism had something in common with Communism, namely, the anti-democratic nature of the dictatorship. He defined the Socialist Party as a mere paper bugbear, whose strength is furnished by cowardly fear on the part of the bourgeoisie. The Republican Party, according to him, deserved pardon for all its mistakes and sins, because of the patriotic stand it took. The "People's Party" (clerical), which draws its power from 30,000 priests, is to be criticized for its occasional anti-nationalistic and defeatist attitude.

But after he was through with the critical analysis, he presented no synthesis whatever. His fiery panegyric upon the bloody deeds of the past leads to the presumption that the road to be followed by the Fascisti movement in the future will still be one of unrestrained persecution of the workers.

If we examine the sum total of the political achievements of the Congress, under the supposition that the Fascisti Party justifies its existence in Italy, we are led to the conclusion that it is a party of the strictest and most uncompromising conservatism, in spite of the respectful hint of a possible republic. It can become useful only in case the monarchy proves too weak against "the enemies of the Fatherland".

Certain labor-union tendencies on the part of individual Fascisti leaders who have not yet completely forgotten their past

activities in the most advanced ranks of the workers prove nothing to the contrary. Pasella, for example, who is now the general secretary of the Fascisti League, was, until shortly before the war, secretary of the Piombino Labor Chamber, which under his leadership became famous for the organization of great and frequent mass-strikes.

The results of the Congress, which are supposed to have formulated the outline for the final program of the Fascisti Party, are as follows:

1. A freemason *Anti-clericalism* as a reaction against the Catholic National Party, which at its last Congress in Venice turned left.

2. Economic *Liberalism* as opposed to the system of monopoly and to every attempt at State-socialism.

3. Anti-democratic *military dictatorship*, free from every petty-bourgeois-parliamentary obstruction, as an ideal form of government.

4. Imperialistic *Nationalism* as opposed to the pacifistic tendencies of the middle-class and the international ideology of the proletariat.

The Fascisti Congress would perhaps have passed off unobserved, had the Roman proletariat not taken this opportunity for pointing the way to all Italian workers for the struggle against the violence of the reactionary forces, by carrying out out their powerful and victorious strike.

The 40,000 Fascisti who had poured into Rome, came from the cities and provinces which are bleeding from the martyrdom of thousands of workers and peasants who had been murdered. With them they brought the habit and need for provocation and bandits' tactics. They also intended to demonstrate their activity in the capital, which for reasons of international diplomacy, was always spared every act of civil war. Armed to the teeth with guns, pistols and bombs, they were able to reach Rome in special trains, without any interference by the government, nay, with the full consent of the government. Blood was shed just as a division of Fascisti arrived. As the train passed the railroad factories, the Fascisti opened fire against the workers. One worker fell to the ground dead. The news spread over the large railstation like wild fire. The excited and embittered masses carried the news of the crime and of the intended answer of the working-class everywhere. In a few hours the entire Roman proletariat was astir. The first conflicts took place on the city-streets.

The strike-movement was led by a "Committee of Proletarian Defense", which consisted of representatives from all revolutionary parties. The aim of this action was the withdrawal of all Fascisti troops from Rome. The Fascisti on the other hand, decided not to stir from the city until work had been taken up again. These were two firm decisions which led to a fight for a definite goal. The government, which secretly aided the White Guards (the minister of war took part in the sessions of the Fascisti Military Committee) officially announced its neutrality in the fight. The contest lasted four days. The workers' districts armed themselves for their defence; they mobilized men, women, children and old people, and organized storm-troops which gradually drove the Fascisti divisions back into the center of Rome. The attempt on the part of the Fascisti to attack the suburbs, led to real battles, in which many Fascisti banners were captured by the workers. The workers felt the consequences of inadequate armament. The proletarian victory which was accomplished by the isolation of the Fascisti in the center of the city, which was occupied by government troops, and which led to the withdrawal of the Fascisti from Rome before the strike was ended, cost the workers of Rome seven dead and more than ten wounded, whereas the enemy lost only one dead and a few wounded.

But the results of the movement are not to be based upon these mathematical figures. When we consider the significance of the Roman strike in the light of its political and psychological effects upon the Italian proletariat, we must conclude that it may mark the beginning of a new period of activity for the entire Italian proletariat. We may now consider that the period of inactivity, of stagnation, which is daily preached by the Socialists, has, in view of the results of the first successful attempt at self-defense, received its decree of condemnation. The Communist method of force against force has proved to be the only way of liberating the working-class from the tragic yoke of Fascism.

Every revolutionary organization of Italy is again faced with the problem of arming the proletariat. After their defeat in Rome, the Fascisti abrogated the famous "Treaty of Peace" which they had concluded with the Socialists a few months ago. This means the renewal of the capitalist attack in a still more bloody and violent form. This requires the preparation of an effective defense on the part of the working-class.

During the Roman strike and after it, the Communist Party formulated the following program of direct action:

"A weapon in every proletarian home!"

"A communist storm-troop in every house in which workers dwell!"

"Solidarity and readiness to fight in the ranks of all Italian workers!"

The Belgian General Election.

by J. Jacquemotte (Brussels).

The P. O. B.

Since November 1918, the government of Belgium has been a coalition of the Catholic, Liberal and Socialist parties. Taking office soon after the armistice, the government of the "Sacred Union", which continued the war policy of the Hâvre government comprised six Catholics, three Liberals and three Socialists (Vandervelde, Anseele and Wauters). It was a liquidation government, charged with preparing the general elections of the basis of universal suffrage of all men over 21 yrs. of age.

The collaboration of the Social-Democrats was, in the first place, decided upon by the General Council of the P. O. B. (Belgian Workers' Party), and ratified by the National Congress after the ministers had already accepted the offers of posts in the Cabinet. They were appointed on a purely provisional basis and for a maximum term of six months. They remained one year and only formally departed with the general elections of 1919.

In this election the Social-Democrats made notable progress in the way of increasing their representation in Parliament. They jumped from 39 seats in the former Chamber (elected under the system of plural voting — one vote for the poor and three votes for the rich) to 70 seats out of a total of 186 in the new. The Social-Democratic group was in numerical strength just behind the Catholics (72 deputies) and far ahead of the Liberals (35 deputies).

A new Coalition government was constituted. The Social-Democrats called it "the government of democratic union". It contained five Catholics, four Socialists and three Liberals. Having become a government party, the Belgian Social-Democracy acted as all government parties do. It voted, without reserve, for the war-budget — which it called, to save its face, "budget of national defense" — the religious budget, the budget of the royal household, in short, all the financial expenditures of the bourgeois state.

Obtaining on the one hand, the passage of the eight-hour day law, with important amendements in favor of the employers, of a provisional law for old-age pensions (a maximum of 720 francs yearly to workers over 65 years of age), of the establishment of a special crisis fund, with 90,000,000 francs at its disposal, for the aid of the unemployed (the number of unemployed exceeds 200,000 out of a total of approximately 1,000,000 industrial workers), the Social-Democracy, on the other hand, put at the service of the Belgian bourgeoisie all its influence with the proletariat. It defeated the proposal of the "Frontpartij"; establishing the term of compulsory military service at six months, and accepted the bourgeois program of ten months service in the infantry and seventeen months in the cavalry. It granted to clerical instruction subsidies equal to those granted by the State to government education. It voted the increase of salaries and pensions for ministers of religion, and approved a standing army of 130,000 men (as against 33,000 before the war — the war for justice and general disarmament!). It granted a subsidy of 250,000,000 francs to the bourgeoisie for the conquest of foreign markets. It solemnly affirmed the duty of the workers to accept the tax on wages as a contribution to "national restoration". In short, it put the entire apparatus of the Social-Democracy at the service of the bourgeoisie.

However, owing to the methodical reestablishment of its power — so seriously shaken after the war — a part of the Belgian bourgeoisie desired to rid itself of the collaboration of the Social-Democrats, who in spite of everything were obliged to justify their collaboration in the government by the defense of reforms which the bourgeoisie would have liked to avoid. On the other hand the proletarian masses, still strongly influenced by the P. O. B., saw with rising indignation the abandoning of the socialist program by the leaders of the P. O. B.

It may be said that, on the eve of the elections each of the three coalition parties desired, during the campaign, to obtain perfect freedom of movement.

The bourgeoisie desired to rid themselves of the more or less undesired company of the Social-Democrats, while the latter feared the increasing opposition of the Belgian proletariat to the policy of collaboration. Somewhat singular indeed was the cause of the rupture.

The Belgian Trade-Union Commission had organized a "Trade-Union Week", during which the question of the control of industry was to be studied by the leaders of the executives of the various trades. Be it noted in passing that after long and expensive palavers, nothing resulted but vague, very vague intimations of the demand for workers' control of industry, and no plan of action was contemplated, aside from the eventual introduction in Parliament of a bill. . . .

The Trade-Union Commission had appealed for the collaboration of trade-union leaders from France, Italy and Germany. For France came Merrheim, the vilifier of the Bolshevik Revolution, and for Germany . . . Sassenbach, social attaché of the German embassy at Rome!!

A nationalist association of ex-soldiers used the pretext of Sassenbach's presence at La Louvière, a city near which the sessions were being held, to organize a patriotic demonstration. The socialist workers, before such a provocative attitude of the Nationalists, energetically counter-demonstrated and several clashes took place.

A few days after this affair, the Nationalist associations of ex-soldiers organized a manifestation to avenge the insult to the national flag. This manifestation was paralleled by one organized by the Social-Democrats on the occasion of the dedication of a flag by a socialist ex-soldiers association. This flag is red and carries as an emblem a soldier breaking his gun. The Social-Democratic minister Anseele dedicated this flag in person, in the name of the P. O. B.

The next day there was a storm in the bourgeois press. The Liberal Minister of War, Devèze, announced his resignation in case Anseele remained in the cabinet. The Catholics and the Liberals stood behind the war-minister, and finally Anseele resigned together with his three Social-Democratic colleagues.

It is fitting to add that in the discussion in the Chamber on these incidents the Social-Democrats indulged in a debauch of patriotism. They energetically protested against the imputation that they desired to cause insubordination among the troops. According to them, the soldier breaking his gun only signifies a pacifist hope for universal disarmament. They affirmed with particular insistence that national defense was a cardinal point of their program and that they were ready, if the fatherland were endangered, again to throw the proletariat — in the name of the supreme interest of the nation! — into the bloody hell of war. Furthermore, they concluded by voting a resolution disavowing and condemning in the strongest terms any act of indiscipline or revolt on the part of the soldiers!

The Social-Democrat ministers remained outside of the cabinet, and a few days later, taking advantage of the designation of the Fleming Van Camvelaert as burgemeester of Antwerp, the Liberal ministers also resigned.

At the basis of all these events was only the desire of the leaders of all the coalition parties to disengage themselves, in the eyes of the voters, from any entangling ties with the other parties. The Social-Democracy, in particular, profited by the occasion to present itself before the voters as a class party, fighting the oppressions of the bourgeoisie! Vandervelde called Anseele's resignation a "lockout", representing him as a good worker, discharged and thrown out of work by an evil employer because he was a Socialist!

The results of the election.

The strength of the respective parties remains approximately the same. The Social-Democrats have probably lost two or three seats, the Catholics have gained three or four, and the Liberals two or three. In short, the Catholic Party remains the strongest group in the Chamber, without having a majority and the Social-Democrats are again rather close behind.

The smaller parties, which had here and there gained one or two seats in the 1919 elections, have had but little success this year. The nationalist ex-soldiers, who, in Brussels, had two deputies, have lost one. The "middle classes", which had succeeded in electing one deputy in Brussels, no longer had the necessary number of votes. The "Frontpartij", Fleming activists, held their own with perhaps a slight loss.

If one is to draw a general conclusion from the 1921 election, it can be said that it marks the old grouping around the standard of the traditional parties, a slight gain for the bourgeois parties and an insignificant loss for the Social-Democrats.

The Communists.

The young Communist Party participated in the elections in only two districts, Brussels and Verviers. The conditions in which the party was fighting were truly unfavorable. On the one hand, its numbers are still very small. It only possesses one French and one Flemish paper, each appearing but once a week, and financial means are absolutely lacking. On the other hand,

the party was formed by the union of the former very small party and the left elements in the P. O. B., which left the latter after the last Congress, held at Easter. The former party was almost exclusively composed of anti-parliamentarians, who, although yielding to international discipline, yet hesitate to employ the parliamentary weapon. Therefore, the strength of the party can not be estimated according to the results of the election. In Brussels, nearly 2,500 votes were cast for the Communist ticket, and in Verviers more than 1,000.

It is necessary for the development of Communism in Belgium that the party's position on Parliamentarism be defined and that the organization of groups and the development of the press be actively pushed. A Communist daily is, in Belgium, one of the essential conditions of further progress.

The Government of To-Morrow.

At the present time can prophecies be made? What may be stated is that the working masses influenced by the P. O. B. are more and more opposed to further collaboration with the bourgeoisie. However, it is likely that the leaders will not hesitate to attempt again the constitution of a Coalition government, while seeking to create an opposition of the right and of the extreme left. On the eve of the elections, the former minister of Sciences and Arts, the Nationalist and Social-Democrat, Destree, declared that it was no doubt advisable not to participate in the government immediately after the elections, but that the coalition system would end by leaving the bourgeoisie no other alternative. He added that the latter by itself could not extricate the state from its economic and financial difficulties, but that the Social-Democrats should wait until they were "in the morass up to their necks" before offering them aid!

The other Social-Democratic leaders develop the same theme, under a different form and state that no government can leave the Social-Democrats out of account, that numerically, it is the second party in the Chamber and that it is impossible to govern against the working-class. A Social-Democratic Congress has been called for the beginning of December and we shall soon have definite information on that point. The backstairs discussions have already begun.

What I may definitely say is that if the Belgian Social-Democratic Party does not immediately enter into the government, it will always be ready to collaborate. It remains in the ministerial antichamber ready to respond to the first appeal of the bourgeoisie. Having become a government party, the P. O. B. will continue along the same path. But in an industrial country such as Belgium, the working masses will finish by having their word to say. The workers see more and more clearly that the former Socialist Party is entirely abandoning the terrain of the class-struggle. They will turn toward the only real basis open to them, — the Socialism of the class-struggle — Communism.

ECONOMICS

Republican Perplexities.

by V. Stern (Vienna).

Austria has just as little reason as Germany to celebrate in a specially festive mood the third anniversary of the "Republic" (the Social-Democrats are not even courageous enough to speak of an anniversary of the Revolution). The political retreat is also not so evident to every worker here as in Germany, for the reason that here we never advanced as far as they did in Germany. But on the other hand the economic collapse is so much the more horrible and depressing, notwithstanding the decline in unemployment.

The Austrian crown has fallen to less than a thousandth part of its peace-time value, and it is falling still further from day to day. The new Christian-Socialist finance minister Gürtler who permitted the Jewish bank director Rosenberg to be elected as adviser by the Pan-Germans and Christian Socialists, that is the anti-Semitic majority, removed the veil a few days ago from Austria's financial skeleton. Even the most incurable optimists were horror-struck at the sight which was uncovered thereby. For the first time some idea could be had of this little country's government-debt. In order to give less awe-inspiring figures, the minister based his calculations on the value of the crown for the first half of October. Meanwhile the crown has fallen to half the value it had then, and yet the government-debt thus reckoned, amounts to no less than 670 milliards, that is, more than 100,000 crowns for every person of the population. As this debt is to a great extent a foreign one, it has for this very reason attained to inconceivable proportions. The yearly deficit

for 1922, reckoned on the basis of the same exchange-value, will amount to 165 milliards, actually more than double amount, even if the government should utilize all plans not as yet considered in its budget. These plans which are intended as a cure and which are mostly taken from the notorious Social Democratic financial-plan, threaten the masses with most fearful consequences. In the first place the food subsidies are to be suspended. This might be reckoned, on the October rate of exchange, as capable of bringing in 85 milliards, or more correctly double the sum. The food-articles still under control such as bread, fats, sugar, milk, will therefore rise in price. The price of a loaf of bread rose a few days ago to 34 crowns. After the subsidy-suspension it will increase at least ten-fold. Bourgeois newspapers calculate that in that case the minimum for existence will be an income of a million crowns a year. The new indirect taxes being planned provide for a liquor-tax which will bring in eight billions. Railroad fares and freight rates are tripled. A five-fold increase in the price of tobacco is already decided upon. The new railroad-fares are to bring in 32 milliards. The raising of the price of tobacco is especially irritating, as the sale of tobacco already brings in 5,500,000 crowns net profit, and so it is impossible to use the argument of deficit as in the case of the railroads and post. On top of all that, the government announces a law which will permit landlords to quadruple the rents so that the taxes can be raised correspondingly. The Social Democratic municipality of Vienna does not allow itself to be outstripped and wants to collect a dwelling construction-tax which will on the average be double the amount of the rent. This means that the latter will be increased three-fold. Besides, Austria is to be blessed with a goods turnover tax or according to the proposal of the Social-Democrats a money turnover tax as this sounds better. There is to be no limit to the taxes. The discharge of officials will be carried out in such a way that little by little officials of all ranks will be gotten rid of with each successive wage-cut. In this way the reduction in wages will be made in a round-about way. At the same time decided economizing is introduced as regards the workers in government-employ. Naturally, this is possible only if these workers are to be driven still harder than now. In this way the eight-hour day which is already in bad shape is to be further impaired.

Thus the openly ruling bourgeoisie and the secretly ruling Social Democrats want to check the fast-growing deficit. Even bourgeois economists admit that this is impossible. Well might the government save and take in milliards on the one hand at the expense of the workers. But the rise in the cost of living and the increase of wages which will come as a result, will cost the government further numberless milliards on the other hand. The rate of exchange will in any case fall still further, because most of the food must be purchased abroad. The entire result of this "financial policy" can only be that the speed of the rise in the cost of living will be accelerated without a financial cure being reached.

This is the economic outlook here, three years after the "Upheaval". And politically? The mad Karl-uprising has spared us the need for going into an examination of the enormous danger threatening the Austrian proletariat as a result of the complete inaction and passivity of the Social-Democrats in the moments of greatest danger, and their blind trust in the aid of reactionary powers (Big Entente, Little Entente, Hohenzollern, Pan-German and indeed even Christian-Socialist, therefore Karl-list ministers). But the result of the bourgeois and Social-Democratic policy is sad enough. Burgenland will be occupied by our army of defense, but it is nevertheless a fact that Oedenburg and its whole industrial surroundings which are the country's most valuable point of support, will simply be handed over to Hungary after the comical formality of a vote. Horthy is stronger than the Social-Democrats who are daily announcing his overthrow at the hands of the Little Entente. The West-Hungarian uprising has yielded him Oedenburg, which surely cannot result in frightening back the Magyar White Guards from a repetition of the adventure. The Peace Treaty is torn up for Horthy's benefit. Not only does the Entente no longer demand Hungary's disarmament, but it even protects Hungary against demands of such a nature coming from its neighbours. And the worst of it is that present conditions are ripe for the uniting of all reactionary forces, in order to make a common attack against Soviet Russia. This becomes only too clearly evident in the treaty between Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, which is openly pointed against Soviet Russia.

And the outlook in the domestic policy is no less tragic. The arousal of the masses could have easily been utilized in order to do away with the Reaction by one fatal blow. Now the Re-

action is stronger than ever. A very small incident is characteristic of this. A recruiting-agent for the Hungarian bands, by the name of Rakonich, was appointed by the Christian-Socialists as government-official. The Social-Democrats raised an immense clamor in order to give the semblance of a "fight against the Reaction". Then there was quiet, and Rakonich is still a government-employee. During the Karl rebellion, the government-organ, the "Reichspost", rejoiced over Karl's return. After the failure of the adventure, the Social-Democrats nevertheless make peace with the Christian-Socialists. Renner, who, needless to say, simply made a Parliamentary attack against the Christian-Socialist traitors, went too far (!) according to the opinion of his party and he was reprimanded. The secret Coalition is once more in good order.

In spite of all this, the Social-Democracy controls the masses through its powerful organization, its press, the prestige of a unified Party, and last but not least, through the maliciously concealed, most brutal of Terrors which is at work to keep the masses within its ranks. The small Communist Party still has to struggle against an iron wall of calumny, mistrust, and timidity but it is winning out through tenacious interior organization work, through firmness and activity. This must soon show outward success, for the triumph of the Capitalist and Social-Democratic policy presents an excellent intuitive method of instruction.

State Capitalism Before and During the Dictatorship.

E. Pawlowski.

When we read the utterances of the international Communist press on the question of state capitalism, we find some of them to be erroneous. The main error lies in the fact, that they speak of state capitalism, without examining the situation of the political power in the state where the so-called state capitalism exists. We can sharply distinguish three economic systems from one another, all of which are equally designated by the words state capitalism.

The first form is the *state capitalism in a capitalistic state*. In the capitalistic state, the government is the executive organ of the bourgeoisie's interests the state, the organized strong-arm of the capitalist class. *Here state capitalism consists of institutions which protect all the members of the property-owning class against the possible special interests of individual capitalist groups.* We find for instance, a strong capitalist movement in all countries for government control of railroads, the post-office, and the telegraph, and recently in England for government control of the coal-mines. It goes without saying that government ownership of this sort, and that the government control of certain branches of industry, leave the social relations of state power absolutely untouched. The state, acting as owner and manager of enterprises, is only an individual economic being in the midst of Capitalism; the state enterprises are managed in the same manner, and the workers are exploited just as much as in the private capitalistic enterprises.

A second variety of this state capitalism is the so-called "war-socialism", of which the one existing in Germany during the war is the most typical example. The free control by the capitalist over the goods produced by them is taken away and transferred to government organs. It was determined by the state how much of a certain article should be produced. The state fixed the selling price. No change whatever took place in the relations of power within the state itself. The armed force of the state continued to remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The state acted in the interest—or at least in the presumptive interest—of the ruling classes as a whole.

It is self-evident that the so-called *state capitalism* which is about to be instituted in Russia, is something totally different from the other, in spite of the fact that outwardly, it bears a great resemblance to it. The main difference lies in the different structure of the state; which carries out the economic control. While in the state capitalism of a capitalistic state, the interests of the ruling classes as whole, are the directing influence in the economic management, the state control in Russia is managed in the interests of the proletariat.

The difference is plainly to be seen in every respect. In Russia, the state is the representative of the workers' interests. The interests of the proletariat are therefore the deciding factors in the regulating of production, in the distribution of products, in the application of the social-political laws, etc. Indeed, the objection may be raised that a part of the proletariat is at

present being exploited in Russia, in spite of the fact that the political power is in the hands of the working-class. But in the struggle between exploiters and exploited there is a great difference between the state-power being on the side of the proletariat or its being on the side of the capitalists! Just to illustrate: In the capitalist state, it is only the capitalists who have the unrestricted right of organization and assemblage; it is only they who can freely and undisturbed unite for the protection of their interests against the workers. With us the opposite is the case. The workers have the absolute right of organization and assemblage and the unconditional support of the state in their conflicts with the employers. On the other hand the capitalists cannot possibly create any class organizations, and in no case can they count upon the support of the state in their struggles against the workers. The same difference is to be found in the judiciary. In the capitalist state the whole court-system is working for the capitalists, in Soviet Russia it is working in the interest of the workers.

This would be the case even if the extent of the state economic management in Soviet Russia were relatively no greater than those in a capitalist state. In other words: *even if Soviet Russia had only just as many persons in the direct service of the state, as a capitalist state has, which has many state enterprises, and an extensive state capitalism, the state capitalism of Soviet Russia would still essentially differ from the one in a capitalist state.* The Russian state capitalism is an institution for the proletariat; the state capitalism in a capitalist state is an institution for the ruling classes. The social significance of an economic institution is always determined by the position of political power.

A third form of state capitalism may be considered: *State capitalism as a stage of transition.* Just at present there are a number of countries in Central and Eastern Europe which are facing bankruptcy. The only solution is offered by the expropriation of the means of production on a large scale. The German working-class is fighting for this; the motto of "seizure of gold value" is only a vague and ill-chosen expression for these endeavours. In substance it means: the seizure of a great part of the private means of production for government purposes.

The bourgeoisie is offering bitter opposition to such an expropriation of the means of production. The reason is self-apparent: next to the armed force, the direct control of the means of production is the main factor in the power of the bourgeoisie. It is only exceptional that in the interest of the class as a whole, the bourgeoisie leaves the management of certain economic enterprises like railroads, post and telegraph, to their state, because such enterprises might become a dangerous monopoly in the hands of a single capitalist group. The tax-fight in Germany, Austria, Poland and in all other countries of Eastern Europe has for its purpose the expropriation of large parts of the means of production of various sorts. This fight must therefore of necessity sharpen itself into a fight for or against the expropriation of the means of production. Should the proletariat be the victor in this fight, the state will acquire many large economic enterprises, which the state will have to organize and manage. That is state capitalism again. The question is only: would this be a capitalistic or a proletarian state capitalism?

Certainly neither of the two. The state organization which after a successful tax-fight would lead to the expropriation of a great part of the property-owning classes, would no longer be a capitalist state in the old sense; but neither would it be a proletarian state. It would be a sort of transition state, a new type of state, whose further development would be determined by the positions of power held by the classes.

This shows us that it is absolutely incorrect to interchange the state capitalism of a proletarian dictatorship with the state capitalism of a capitalistic government which is still intact, or with the one of a transition period, which latter is the present tendency of development in Central and Eastern Europe. The factor common to all three of these, outside of the name, is the fact that in each of them a great part of the economic management is under the direct control of the state, which also has a considerable influence upon the remaining parts. But just because of the difference in social structure of these forms of government, these three types of state capitalism are fundamentally different from one another; which means that the problems become confusing instead of clear, when the characteristics of the capitalistic state capitalism are without more ado assigned to the state capitalism of proletarian Russia, as is now systematically done by all enemies of Soviet Russia.

The October Production in the Don Basin.

In the year 1920—21 the Don region produced:

| | | |
|-----------|------------|---------------|
| January | 23,500,000 | poods of coal |
| February | 29,500,000 | " " " |
| March | 33,100,000 | " " " |
| April | 30,100,000 | " " " |
| May | 24,700,000 | " " " |
| June | 18,000,000 | " " " |
| July | 9,100,000 | " " " |
| August | 11,300,000 | " " " |
| September | 18,400,000 | " " " |

besides 1,500,000—2,000,000 poods which were produced on the small coal fields which were leased.

October 33,000,000 poods of coal

besides 5,000,000—6,000,000 poods produced on the leased fields, making a total of 38,000,000—39,000,000 poods of coal. In October we gained a victory. Not only did the gross production increase, but the net production also increased. The Don coal-region consumed for mining purposes:

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------------|
| In March | 14,600,000 | poods of coal |
| In May | 10,800,000 | " " " |
| In July | 8,600,000 | " " " |

so that in July our net-production amounted to only 500,000 poods of coal. In October 10,000,000 poods of coal were used up in the process, thus leaving a net production of 23,000,000 poods for this month.

The worker's capacity for production also increased. One miner produced:

| | | |
|-----------------|-------|-----------------|
| In 1914 | 3,158 | poods per month |
| In 1915 | 3,000 | " " " |
| In March 1921 | 1,958 | " " " |
| In October 1921 | 3,300 | " " " |

The causes responsible for our victory are to be found in the efficient collective supplying of the worker with bread, in the piece-work wage-system, in the concentration of production on the most important fields and in the extension of the labor-unions' powers.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Meeting of the National Council of the Italian C. G. L. at Verona.

by A. Bordiga.

The session of the National Council of the C. G. L. (General Federation of Labour) took place at Verona from the 5th to the 8th of November. After the General Congress this council is the most important body of the C. G. L.; it consists of representatives of all the local trade councils (in Italy every province has its Labour Council) and of all the National Unions. In contradistinction to the Congress the National Council does not consist of delegates directly elected by the local organizations but of officials of the Labour Councils and Unions. These officials do not even consult the committees of the separate local Unions before their appearance at the National Council.

This time the meeting of the National Council was of especially great importance. The calling of this council had been demanded by the Communist Trades-Union Committee three months ago; by means of an open letter, which was accompanied by a mandate of the Executive Committee of the Party, it put forward a proposal of proletarian action against the offensive of the employers and the various Italian trade-union organizations (Confederation of Labour, the Syndicalist Union and the Railwaymen's Union) were asked to call their National Councils in order to consider the communist proposal and to form a united Committee of Action with a view of carrying into effect. The purport of the proposal was the establishment of a united front of all the workers' organizations in order to combine the various partial local struggles, which resulted from the offensive of the employers, to put forward definite important demands and to attain these demands by a national general strike of the entire working-class. The open letter of the Communist Trade-Union Committee contained the following demands: an eight-hour working day; recognition of the existing rate of wages; proper assistance to the unemployed; control of the workers on questions of dismissal from employment; the rights and liberty of organisation.

In view of the urgency of these proposals the calling of the National Council and not of the General Congress was demanded, and at the same time began an intensive agitation amongst the masses in favour of the action proposed by the communists. From August till now a large number of meetings of workers have expressed themselves in favour of the proposal of the communists, which, however, did not find support from the leaders of the organisation. The syndicalists and anarchists of the Syndicalist Union also greeted it with little enthusiasm, while the Railwaymen's Union (which is being led by an anarchist-socialist coalition) expressed approval but only in words and not by deeds; the socialists of the General Federation of Labour brutally declared themselves against the proposal. At first the trade-union leaders entirely ignored the Communist Trade-Union Committee. They were, however, compelled soon to give up this policy, as in the masses the dissatisfaction with the negative attitude of the C. G. L. was constantly growing. The Executive then issued their own proposal which consisted in a demand to the government to establish an Inquiry Commission in order to inquire into the condition of industry and as to whether the demands of the capitalists for a reduction of wages are justified. The manifesto which was issued by the C. G. L. and the Socialist Party in connection with their proposal, by recognizing the eventual award of this Inquiry Commission, actually recognizes the principle that the wages of the workers may be reduced if the profits of capital decrease.

This ridiculous anti-socialistic formula just as the proposal for a Commission of Inquiry itself caused attacks from the communists whose energy increased in view of the growing support of the masses. In the meantime in various places the situation became more tense as a result of the attempts to reduce wages. In many branches of industry notice was given of the existing agreements and wages were reduced; in the textile, metal and chemical industry struggles commenced. At the end of October the metal workers in the Trieste province and in Liguria were on strike, while in the province of Piedmont and in Lombardy a strike was threatened. Apart from that, all over Italy the wool-weavers were striking and in various places there were movements of lesser importance. The dissatisfaction among the workers was growing and the communists were able to greatly strengthen their position in the National Council of the F. I. O. M. (Federazione Italiana Operai Metallurgici—Italian Metal Workers' Union) 45,000 against 65,000. Their representatives were also elected to the Committee of Action of the metal workers. A strike in that important branch of industry was approaching; while the government accepted the proposal of the C. G. L. to establish an Inquiry Commission, the employers opposed it because they wished a fight.

The leaders of the trade-union were compelled to call together the National Council for the 5th of November. Short notice was given in order that the conference should consist only of officials; in view of the short notice it was impossible for the organizations to meet beforehand; all sorts of excuses were used in order to ignore entirely the actual following of the parties (as recorded by the numbers of votes), the more so as in a number of organizations, also in those where the socialist influence predominates, voices were heard against the Executive Committee and in favour of the communists.

In Lombardy notice was given of a strike of metal workers to begin on Monday the 1st of November, which actually amounted to a strike on a national scale. On Sunday, a day before that, the government and the reformist leaders developed feverish activity. At last they succeeded in obtaining from the employers concessions which, notwithstanding the opposition of the communists led to an understanding. Thus, the strike which ought to have commenced on Monday was declared off. The settlement, according to which the *status quo* had to be maintained in the works of Lombardy up to December 31st, meant in reality a silent acceptance of the Commission of Inquiry and of the famous principle, that wages have to be cut down if it is proved that the capitalists find themselves in a difficult position. This agreement, further, broke up the national front of the metal workers as it prevented the struggle in Lombardy, while in Liguria, Trieste and other parts of the country the strike continued. The agreement was to be ratified at a meeting of the metal-workers of Milan, but the meeting ended in a free fight between the communists and socialists. By superhuman efforts, the reformist leaders, those agents of the government, who believed a campaign of the Communists to be imminent, succeeded in stopping the movement of the workers of the chemical industry by an agreement which became the subject of heated discussions.

Such was the situation when the conference at Verona commenced. There were about 200 delegates present, amongst them about 60 of the communist opposition. Between the two

parties a distinct division became apparent. The communists attacked the trade-union leaders on questions of principle. The latter put forward their best speakers in their defense and openly expressed hatred of the communists and their desire to expel them from the C.G.L. if the communist trade-union organizations would not be strong enough to defeat such intentions.

At the conference the communists were animated by the strict discipline which distinguishes our minority in the C.G.L. They took their directions from the Communist Trade-Union Committee enlarged by a representative of the Party Committee, thus all its actions were consequent and clear. The socialists were held together by their fear and dislike of the communists. The Socialist Party, which is united with the C.G.L. by an "alliance", was not represented. At the end of the meeting a telegram of the Party Executive was received stating that the party was not represented as Serrati was abroad. The whole of the socialist press, however, especially "Avanti", was at the disposal of the trade-union leaders in their campaign against the communists. The struggle from the very outset centered not so much on questions of principle as on questions of the respective influence of the two groups. The communists protested frequently against the systematic wirepulling used by the trade-union leaders.

In order to appraise correctly the voting at this conference it is necessary to take into consideration the following:

1. The voting took place on the basis of the membership of 1920. That means a number of votes was assumed which in the meantime had decreased by half. This was directed against the communists as the votes recorded for them came from really existing organizations, which had been conquered by the communists during 1921 and had adopted their proposal while hundreds of thousands of non-existing numbers were taken to be in favour of the caucus because it could not be proved that they had been voting against the decisions of the C. G. L. Such a proof for the communists was the only means of retaining their votes and even this did not always succeed. It will suffice to instance the case of the Agricultural Workers' Union. It has a membership now of only about 200,000 yet a vote was recorded for 800,000 members. (This enormous decrease in membership is to be explained by the effect of the Fascisti activities in the rural districts). The communists had a minority which would have formed a big percentage of the 200,000 if really existing organizations that only affiliated in 1921 had been allowed to vote.

2. In accordance with the rules, the votes were recorded in a peculiar manner. One and the same organization is twice represented on the National Council—once through the Trade Councils and the second time through the industrial unions. The metal workers' branch of Milan, for instance, votes first as part of the Milan Trade Council, then as a part of the National Metal Workers' Union. Therefore the votes recorded—those of the trade councils as well as those of the National Unions are divided by two. Should all organizations be represented, if for instance the votes of the Milan Metal Workers should be of equal weight in the Trades Council and in the National Union, it would be of no consequence whether the Trade Councils or the National Unions record their votes, the result would scarcely differ. However—the advantages of trade-union "Democracy" are well known! The opposition against the trade-union leaders makes itself strongly felt in the local organization, the trade Councils, but it does not succeed in penetrating into the sanctum sanctorum of the National Unions; thus the latter form a strong reserve of votes in favour of the Trade Union bureaucracy.

3. The communists have been denied the right to represent many organizations especially the minorities of trade-unions and Trades Councils, where often the number of the communist votes is almost equal to that of their opponents.

4. The votes of all organizations which had not discussed the communist proposal—mostly as a consequence of the leaders' obstruction—was quietly counted as recorded for the socialists.

Thus the vote taken at Verona was absolutely fictitious. Should one correctly appraise the real strength of the two groups, the result would appear more favourable to the communists. This, however, is not being done and people satisfy themselves with the fictitious figures which show that the communists received 417,000 and the socialists 1,326,000 votes. In order to come to a correct conclusion one has to take into consideration the fact that had the votes of the Trades Councils been counted, the communists would have received 500,000 against 200,000 of the Socialists. Had only the votes of those actually affiliated in 1921, who number about 1,000,000, been recorded there would have been a ratio of 400,000 to 600,000, since the socialists have lost many more votes than the communists. This means that, at a properly organized congress, where all minorities would be represented and those organizations which had not made up their

minds as to the issues at stake were excluded, the communists could prove that the majority of the organized workers are behind them. Should that be attained, the machinery of dictatorship of the trade union bureaucracy would be destroyed.

The communists demand that a general congress be called, because they do not recognize the vote taken on the question of the international which showed a majority for Amsterdam; they did not participate in it as they consider that only the general congress has the authority to decide this question.

The Communist Party has issued a manifesto announcing that they will increase their efforts to conquer the trade unions, since the conference at Verona has proved that the position of the communists in the trade unions is a very strong one.

By means of a ever-growing net of communist groups and Communist Trade-Unions Committees controlled by the party the latter will manage to attain control of the General Federation of Labour, and thus to create a proper basis of representation instead of the present one which affords the trade union leaders possibilities for all sorts of machinations.

At the Congress, the struggle now going on in every trade union organisation will be continued; it will bring new victories to our party. The party will put forward the following program for communist trade union activity: affiliation to Moscow, — the closing of the ranks of the proletariat, i. e., the creation of an united proletarian front against the increasing offensive of the employers. Quite apart from the Congress, which the trade union leaders are trying by all means to delay, clear signs are noticeable of an increasing indignation of the masses against the opportunism of the leaders.

As regards the policy of the Communist Party towards the trade unions it found a clear expression in the resolution put forward by the communists at the Verona conference.

This resolution reads:

"Whereas, the employers, in all their political and economic manifestations, are developing a plan for the destruction of the proletarian class organization, which to the governing class seems the only way out of the present situation and a means to keep up their political and economic domination, and to prevent the opposite revolutionary solution towards which the proletariat is driven in its attempt to defend its vital interest and in the development of its economic struggles, and

"Whereas, the readiness to replace the economic struggle of the working-class organizations by an award of a commission in which the representatives of the employers, the government and the yellow trade unions are more numerous than the representatives of the proletarian trade unions, means the retreat before the employers' offensive and the forsaking not only of the class-struggle but of the very existence of working-class organization, all the more so as such action would include the recognition of the principle that a reduction of wages is justified if it corresponds to a decrease of the profits of capital, and

"Whereas, the resistance of the trade unions to the demands of the employers can not lead to a real proletarian victory if the struggle is being carried on in every locality and industry separately, and

"Whereas, the progress of the struggles now going on, even where they led to a truce which does not protect the workers against the reprisals of the employers, which compromises the struggle by the wrong policy of deciding each case on its merits and by the silent recognition of the harmful principle of reducing wages according to the position of the industry, shows clearly that these struggles are only the opening of a further intensification of the capitalist attacks against the gains of the proletariat,

"Be it resolved, that the National Council of the General Federation of Labour declares after a careful analysis of the serious situation in which the Italian proletariat finds itself, that it is the task and duty of the proletarian organisation to direct all its energy towards the defense of a number of demands which are of vital importance to the working-class and mean real proletarian gains, and the maintenance of which is essential to the verexistence of the organisation. These demands are:

- a) An eight-hour working day,
 - b) Actual recognition of the existing agreements of industrial and agricultural workers and no reduction of wages which is not justified by a reduction in the cost of living;
 - c) Maintenance of the unemployed and their families; all costs accruing therefrom to be born by the employers and the state;
 - d) Inviolability and recognition of the right of organization;
 - e) Control by the organization of promotions and dismissals, and,
- "Be it resolved, that the National Council declares that these demands can be attained only by a united front of the

workers of all callings and of all unions, by concerted action and by combining all struggles and wage movements in order to meet the employers' offensive by a general strike of the entire working-class. This Council therefore resolves to elect a Committee of Action, which must immediately communicate with the representatives of all other proletarian organizations of Italy with a view of co-ordinating and leading the movement in accordance with the principles embodied in this resolution in order to combine the separate struggles of the workers, to direct them against the employers' offensive and thus to accomplish the complete development of the proletarian forces".

A few words in conclusion. In the struggle between the communists and the trade-union bureaucracy which consists of the ultra-reformist elements of the right wing of the Socialist Party, the left wing which at the Milan Congress obtained a majority has lost all its importance. Only a few followers of Serrati are not yet prepared to play the part of servants to reformism and have refrained from voting. They, i. e., the "maximalists", who are not prepared to obey every order of D'Aragona & Co. hardly obtained 18,000 votes out of 1,800,000. (In our opinion the actual collaboration finds its expression not so much in a possible socialist-bourgeois ministry of to-morrow as in the policy of the C. G. L. which already quite openly stands on the platform of the solution of present industrial and capitalist crises).

This fact is very instructive to many people who think that a large part of the Italian masses can be gained by a policy of splitting the Socialist Party and of uniting with its left wing. The Socialist Party of Italy is only a shadow as compared with the reality of that "Party of Labour" which has been founded by the C. G. L. and its clique of leaders.

Shifting to the Left.

by Eugen Paul (Prague).

The working-class movement of Reichenberg and of Czechoslovakia in general has made a gigantic step forward. Large groups of the textile workers' union, which has its headquarters at Reichenberg, the center of the Northern Bohemian textile industry, have been revolting for a year or so against the right-socialist bureaucracy. Now the textile workers of Reichenberg, who up till the present, have been the strongest supporters of this clique are following their example.

The union clique had protected itself against the revolting branches: Zwickau, Warnsdorf, Kratzau, Grottau and Neustadt, by expelling them from the union on the ground that they were "endangering" the "united front", as understood by the clique. Thus, about 13,000 textile workers found themselves outside the textile workers' Union — a body of about 80,000 members — for the simple reason that they dared to declare themselves communists and courageously to raise their voice against the clique working hand and hand with the employers. Being expelled from the textile workers' union the men had to establish a union of their own. By this action the clique gained the favour of the employers, who now were in a position to deal with the textile workers as they liked, especially as the latter were already split on national lines, having both a German and Czech trade-union. However, as is said, who draws the sword must perish by the sword. The Reichenberg textile workers whose support the clique tried by all means to retain, were bound, through the insolent provocations of the employers, to arrive at the conclusion that the expulsion of the Communist groups from the union not only did not assist the establishment of a united front of the textile workers but on the contrary, weakened and destroyed it. When things came to a head they staged a large number of very well attended shop meetings, which demanded that the clique should again admit into the unions the expelled groups together with their freely elected shop-stewards and local officials. They further demanded the immediate summoning of a congress of the union in order to decide definitely the questions which had arisen through the expulsion of these groups; further, they demanded the immediate opening of negotiations for unity with the Czech textile workers' union at Brünn.

After the previous experience of their dealings with the artful clique, the textile workers of Reichenberg in order to prevent further delays put forward an ultimatum. They demanded of their leaders a clear and definite reply by December 1st and, in order to impress upon their leaders the seriousness of the situation, they decided in all shop meetings to pay as before their union-dues, but to keep the thus collected money in the shops. Should the Executive Committee not furnish a satisfactory reply by December 1st or refuse the acceptance of expelled branches, the Reichenberg textile workers would go over to the union consisting of the expelled groups in order thus to compel the Executive Committee to reestablish the united front of the textile workers.

At a delegate meeting called by the Executive two days ago, out of the 360 Reichenberg delegates only 70 appeared including the officials of the Executive. Yet the clique would not be true Amsterdammers had they prepared to give way because an overwhelming majority expressed itself against them. God forbid! They are trying by the severest possible pressure and terror to frighten the workers and are not even ashamed to cry out and denounce to the employers those workers who are distributing leaflets directed against the bureaucracy. These methods will of course not help them, on the contrary, they will only hasten the unmasking of the clique.

This great agitation of the Reichenberg workers is of still greater importance in view of the fact that the Czech textile workers are about to embark upon a serious wage struggle and the conflict of the miners in the Ostrau-Karwin district has reached a stage where a general strike can be only delayed but hardly prevented by all the cunning of the clique. In this situation the powerful action of the Reichenberg textile workers against the faithful allies of the capitalists mean a tremendous shifting to the left of the whole of the working-class movement of Czechoslovakia. So much the more since the apparently unshakable Reichenberg clique formed up till now the backbone of the social-democracy of this district, which is now being broken by the unexpected action of the Reichenberg textile workers.

"And yet it moves!"

The History of a Labour Battle.

by J. Tommasi (Paris).

After seventy-six days of battle which at times was very violent, the workers of the Roubaix-Tourcoing Region, belonging to the textile industry so harshly exploited by the heartless employers, have just gone back to work without having been able to terminate successfully the task which they had undertaken.

Causes of the Movement.

In a preceding article I explained the origin of this movement which had for its sole aim the prevention of a new reduction of wages at present insufficient for the excessively high cost of living in this region of the North, which for two years has been a prey to the most rapacious kind of speculation attracted thither by the alluring business opportunities offered by the reconstruction of the devastated regions. That movement was not spontaneous, however. For months the masses had been stirred up by a revolutionary minority which in spite of many difficulties strove to bring them to a better comprehension of the class-struggle.

Since the armistice, and indeed up to the last few months, the Social-Democrats of Roubaix-Tourcoing were content with a policy of class-collaboration, which, however, had not brought much good to the workers. Several months ago, while at Roubaix there still existed a certain amount of confidence in these men and their reformist methods, at Tourcoing, and more especially at Halluin, the workers rid themselves of such methods whose value they knew.

These methods had run their course in the year 1920, when the proletariat of the textile industry of the North had to "accept" a reduction of 30 centimes per hour, without being able even to put up the least resistance.

The employers knew this new spirit, but did not credit it with the value which it really possessed, and they underestimated the extent of its penetration among the masses.

It was thus, that at the beginning of August the employers decided to engage in battle for two purposes. The first was to force a new reduction of 20 centimes an hour; and the second was to assassinate the labor-unions which would be too dangerous a weapon in the hands of the workers on the day when the revolutionary spirit penetrated these labor-bodies.

On the employer's side — There were 300 big manufacturers of the Lille-Roubaix-Tourcoing region, combined into a "Consortium", with two large fortunes at its head which the war and the German occupation had not in any way diminished, on the contrary, it had grown. As secretary there was a rogue by the name of Ley, a workingman's son, himself a workingman who had been somewhat of an anarchist before the war, and had risen in the world by selling himself and betraying his former comrades.

This unscrupulous individual had been a lackey to the "Kommandantur" during the occupation, an auxiliary to German militarism against the unfortunate workers of the region. Moreover, he had got hold of so much documentary information concerning the greater number of the employers composing the "Consortium" that no one dared to budge or protest while this vicious individual was manoeuvring in the most ignominious

fashion, and by his sole misdeed, reducing tens and tens of thousands of workers to the greatest misery.

During these three months he was to be the accursed soul of this criminal action, and in order to constrain the workers to beg for mercy he was to succeed in bending the government, the magistracy, the police and the army to his purpose. He was to employ all means, including the worst, in order to triumph.

On the workers' side—In spite of the decisions, always favorable to the workers, which were given by more or less official bodies before which the questions was put, the employers nevertheless persisted in wanting to reduce wages. Uncovering their batteries at last they spoke of unemployment, took up the theme so dear to the herds of the Labor Confederate pontiffs—that of the “general interest”, of “economic renaissance”, asserting moreover that this reduction was necessary for the revival of business in the Lille-Roubaix-Tourcoing region.

Before such an assertion the workers' conscience awoke. At first there was stupor, then anger, then a cool determination to enter into battle, since that seemed to be the employers' wish.

At the beginning of August the strikers multiplied in number. In Lille the cotton-workers quit work, followed a few days later by the weavers. In Roubaix the construction-workers left their work-yards. Wattrelos, Wasquehal, Halluin, Bousbecque and Verviers follow. In all the centers there was a vast quivering which shook the working-class. The provocations by the employers, the discussions, the tendencies which had taken on a formidable acuteness since the secession at Tours and at the Congress of the C. G. T. held in Lille in July all this awakened in everyone the need for knowledge and resistance.

It is under such circumstances that the general strike of the textile industry broke out on August 16. The employers persisted in wanting to reduce the wages by 20 centimes an hour at two turns, whatever may be the cost of living.

More than 60,000 workers entered the battle at once. The proletariat had suffered too long a time. It was at its rope's end, determined to undergo the last sacrifices in order to impose its rights upon those who live in wealth from its labor and its misery. The discipline imposed upon it seemed an unbearable chain, it felt the need of throwing itself into “direct action”. Its militants would lead it wherever they wished.

The first week, however, was calm. Processions of 20,000, 30,000 and 40,000 strikers marched through the streets of Roubaix singing the “International”, “Revolution”, the “Carmagnole”, songs which left no doubt as to the frame of mind of this admirable crowd.

The second week things were somewhat spoiled. The “Consortium” tried to disrupt the movement with the aid of more or less clean manoeuvres. The response was not long in coming. Yellows (they were not numerous) were prevented from working; trucks were overturned, windows were broken. Electricity was in the air, not much of it was needed in order for the storm to break.

At the “Consortium” they did not make a misstep. They waited for better days.

The Central Strike Committee, confining itself to the methods accepted by most of the militants which compose it, called for calm, placing their confidence in the simple force of right to triumph in this combat.

During the third week nothing happened which would give any hope for an arrangement benefiting the workers. As for amiable arrangements, no one wanted that. The C. G. T. was expected to give the order for making the movement general, as that was the only thing which could force the employers to give up their insolent arrogance and their abominable pretensions.

This decision was taken on September 12; already one month had passed since the beginning of the struggle between employers and textile workers. All the labor-bodies, such as those of metallurgy, construction, gas, electricity, food, municipal service, newspaper dealers, printers and lithographers had all entered the battle to support the cause of the textile workers for which the construction workers of Tourcoing, Roncq and Halluin, and the transportation workers of Roubaix-Tourcoing had already been fighting.

The power of the electric current was cut in half. The lighting of the cities was reduced by three-quarters. For twenty-four hours the food-supply workers and the undertakers' assistants ceased work and resumed it again only on the authorization of the Strike Committee. The cafés were closed, the bartenders' union solidarizing with the workers. The sale of papers was prevented. The local sheets such as the “Journal

de Roubaix” and the “Egalité” no longer appeared. A labor-union customs-line was established on the frontier. Thus, the Belgian workers could not leave their territory. A red police functioned and spread over the city.

Two faint shadows appeared in the picture. The municipal employers of Tourcoing had not followed. Their union had resigned from the Labor Exchange of Tourcoing eight days ago because this Exchange had dared to name a delegate of its tendency to the administrative commission of the Departmental Union of the North after the Congress of the Departmental Union and of the C. G. T. The majority of the Labor Exchange of Tourcoing declared themselves with the Revolutionary Minority, as at the Departmental Congress, and naturally a Minority delegate replaced the preceding one who had been of the Majority. On account of this the municipal workers quitted the Exchange and did not go on strike.

The second shadow was that of the street-car employees of Roubaix-Tourcoing. With them the ill-feeling persisted. However, it had more justification for at the end of the nationalization strike the street-car workers had suffered a great deal. The union had to struggle more than five weeks after the strike to prevent reprisals. During that time the Civic League and the conductors provided a limited service. No one took up the defense of the street-car workers. No organization took a stand against the Civic League. That was a great mistake on our part. The street-car workers of Roubaix-Tourcoing had not pardoned us for that. However, the union workers of the street-cars were not stubborn in face of the big demonstrations, and they led the cars back to their barns. Only the “Mongy” ran from Lille to Roubaix or to Tourcoing, taking care to stop prudently before the toll-stations of these cities.

There were incidents: trucks overturned, automobiles destroyed, windows broken, street-cars damaged. The troops were called. The Sixth of the Light Cavalry and 509th of the Tanks (Champions of the Tanks of France) were going to keep up the bloody tradition. It was of little avail. The strikers were resolute.

The 75,000 working-men and working-women, animated by the faith of revolutionists, did not bend before the governmental threats.

Who then was able to cause such a perfect unity of action? It was the employers' answer, read at the prefecture by M. Boulin, divisional labor-inspector which accomplished this.

General Strike.

Thus the decision was taken—with some rare exceptions all the organizations entered the battle in order that the employers should not succeed in their dishonest designs.

But the moment it broke out, it appeared that the general strike of all the labor-bodies would find itself weakened through the very will of those who caused it to break out. Too many contrary influences brought it about that the general strike did not achieve what one had a right to expect from it, and less than fifteen days after it had broken out, the general strike came to an end without the big filibusterers of the “Consortium” being forced to reduce their pretensions even by the smallest amount.

From that moment on, it was easy to foretell what would be the end, unless the Central Strike Committee would decide to take into consideration the suggestion of our communist comrades of Tourcoing and give up the methods made use of for more than a month and a half, which ended with nothing, except compromises which the workers refused to listen to.

The employers' offensive.

With the general strike ended, the employers thought that the textile workers were going to make honorable amend, and to start the factories working again with this new reduction of salaries.

But there again they were very much mistaken, for the duel continued—determined, ferocious, decisive. Although the workers suffered the direst misery, they were determined to struggle to victory in their just cause.

But though the strike was holding out, the leaders did not think there was any necessity for changing the forms of action applied from the very beginning of the strike.

The attempt was still being made to bring about a conference before an arbitrator and they were certain of easily proving to this arbitrator the justice of the workers' cause.

About October 15, while the battle continued on the side of the workers with very legal tactics, a formidable offensive started from the side of the “Consortium” against all the militants and even the strikers.

Before everything else the employers' side made sure of the aid of the government and the police.

The prefect Nodin, as a good watch-dog for Capital, did everything within his power to break up the movement. Whereas, during an interview, the president of the Cabinet, M. Briand himself, congratulated the militants on their good behaviour in the strike, an order was given to flood the region with a host of military and police.

At the same time there was an avalanche of private letters addressed to workers—these letters written in such tricky, Jesuitical terms that inevitably a certain uneasiness was bound to grow up within the ranks of the strikers.

Next there was an avalanche of posters, all of them just as ignoble and insulting to the private life of the militants, which was calculated to enlarge the breach made in the ranks of the workers by the first manoeuvre.

Finally, for a whole week, the officers, the policemen, the prefect-officials raided the homes of the workers, in order to hasten the disruption within the ranks of the workers. And then, supreme manoeuvre, one fine morning the sirens began to blow, and the doors to open under the protection of the armed forces of the state.

A movement for resumption of work became immediately apparent. The centers subjugated by the methods and the men of reformism surrendered in part.

At Lannoy this movement of resumption of labor began, and immediately spread to Croix and Roubaix and also to Wattrelos like wildfire, stopping only at the gates of Tourcoing.

At Tourcoing thanks to the confidence inspired by the men of action and by the active methods applied by them, the evil did not penetrate; and up to the last day, when it was deliberately decided to go back to work this was a compact block which was to remain in the battle.

At Roncq and at Halluin which were more decidedly won over to Communism and to its methods of direct action, the struggle ended to the advantage of the workers with a renewal of the force of the working-class to organize for battle.

And during all this time the "Consortium" directed its most decisive blows on the points which appeared to it most vulnerable.

Without embarrassing itself by formulas which seemed to be the foremost preoccupation of the Central Strike Committee, the Consortium directed the battle clearly on political grounds.

In addition to the posters insulting the private life of all militants, other posters were full of the writings of trade-unionists more inclined towards reform and dissidence—writing either against the "Russian Revolution", and the "proletarian government" or against the Communist Party.

On Wednesday October 19 it was noticed that a number of workers resumed labor in a majority of the factories. On the next day the number increased tenfold. Friday, the 2nd was an inauspicious day for the strike, and according to the expression of a militant of Roubaix, the laborers crowded to resume work to such an extent that "I was ashamed of it". By Saturday, the 22nd, the resumption of work was complete and on Monday the 24th, the workers' demonstration which came from Tourcoing towards Roubaix was apprised of the fact that most of the factories were in operation.

In view of such a state of things the Strike Committee of Tourcoing, after having fully weighed the consequences of its move, decided on the 30th for the resumption of work for Wednesday November 2nd, and demanded the Central Strike Committee to make a decision immediately.

The leading reformists of Roubaix did not come to this meeting of the Central Committee for reasons more or less obvious.

It is impossible to take up one by one the events of these last eight days of the strike, but what we ought to do without any sort of reserve whatsoever is to draw the lessons from this labor battle, and they are many.

About the C. G. T., also, there is not much to say. It had the opportunity to get back again into the good graces of the workers. Buried in its policy of self-denial, it was incapable even of fulfilling its promises.

The fighters of Roubaix, seeing nothing but promises, seeing that the roads to conciliation were definitely closed, that the war of usury had not reduced in any way the employers' forces, fell back. Already suspicious, they became definitely disaffected, and thus the movement lamentably gave way in spite of the valor of the fighters.

The last fifteen days, out of the 4000 strikers remaining in the struggle, five to six hundred and rarely as much as 800 participated in the demonstrations held in Roubaix, while at Tourcoing and Halluin all the workers took part in the demonstrations.

Conclusions.

The conclusions which we can make are the following: Never, in spite of everything that might have been said, was the movement essentially economic. It immediately took on the aspect of a social movement, and all the forces of reaction hastened to join hands in order to defeat the workers.

Wherever the Reformists and Socialist Dissidents (for there is no difference between the two) tried to apply their policy of "cooperation" of the employers and the workers, there was defeat and disbandment.

Wherever the Communist spirit directed the action, there was success, or the conservation of the force of the union-organization. For example: Roubaix—a loss of 50% for the textile union.

Tourcoing—There were 8,000 organized workers before the strike, and the week following the resumption of work, the number of union-workers was 12,000.

Halluin—is Communist, and Wam de Wattine, Secretary of the Union is at the same time aid to the Communist mayor of Halluin. At Halluin the workers resumed labor after having obtained satisfaction and with all the workers, numbering 4000, joining the unions.

The anti-political policy of the labor-unions, the ignorance of political economy, has just been struck a decisive and mortal blow in the course of the strikes in the North.

The Dissidents among the syndicalists and the political elements have realized it very well. No manoeuvre was overlooked by the them, in spite of all deceitful and pleasant appearances.

Not having succeeded previously in driving out the militants of the C. S. R. (Comités Syndicalistes Révolutionnaires) and the communists, the politicians and the immovable officials of the syndicalism of the "Union Sacrée" attempt now to exclude the militants and the unions who saved the honor of the workers in this battle, instead of working for the regroupment of forces within the union organization.

After having thrown out the Minority militants and the communists from the Co-operative of "Peace" at Roubaix they would like to get rid of them by throwing them out of the "Confédération Générale du Travail" under the rather odd pretext of "indiscipline".

They will not succeed, and Roubaix, Tourcoing, and Halluin will become so many fortresses of Communist-Syndicalism, joining the already numerous forces (which to-morrow will be the majority) which, fully conscious of the necessities imposed by the class-struggle, are preparing to join the revolutionary organization of workers—The International of Red Trade Unions of Moscow.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Communist Prospects in France.

by Albert Treint. (Paris).

In June 1920, after the defeat of the railway-strike, the same situation existed in France as the one which exists in Italy to-day.

The French bourgeoisie felt itself tottering during the strikes in the Paris district in 1919, at the time of the mutinies in Chartres and Toulouse, on the occasion of the sailors' return from the Black Sea, and then again later in February 1920 during the railway-strike.

The Revolution has been twice within reach of the Italian proletariat — the first time in 1919, when the small shop-keepers went to hand over their store-keys to the Labor Exchange as the only real authority; and the second time in 1920, when the workers seized the factories.

In the confusion following the war the leaders of the labor movement in France as well as in Italy were in a position to attempt daring strokes with sufficient chance of success, thanks to the revolutionary events which started spontaneously in some measure everywhere.

The drowsy torpor and the reformist paralysis of the labor organizations permitted the bourgeoisie to recover, and to get organized, if not for production, at least for counter-revolutionary repression.

Tired of futile struggles in which the interest of their class was betrayed, persecuted, thrown into the street, and abused

in every way by a heartless employer-class, many workers gave up their effort in despair, and abandoning revolutionary action, they restricted their horizon and became addicted to social scepticism and the collective selfishness of the family.

The weakened, overworked, brutalized working-class could not resist falling asleep for a moment. The result was lower wages and long work-days. The employers make haste to wake up the workers with blows of a cudgel.

The elite of the workers felt themselves honor-bound to mount guard in the Communist Party, and in the *Comités Syndicalistes Révolutionnaires* (C. S. R.).

The workers will unite sooner or later in the labor-unions, as a result of the employers' ever-growing menace. The workers lacking a revolutionary education have always been more powerfully attracted by the grouping according to trades, than by grouping according to doctrine.

Foreseeing the struggle of the future, and foreseeing the necessity of revolutionary education for the working masses in the labor-unions, the French Communist Party has decided to put the question of the relations between the Party and the trade-unions as first on the order of business at the Marseilles Congress.

This question which has been easy to solve everywhere else, is of a particularly delicate nature in France. Syndicalism has had its development in France organically independent of political parties. Although it asserted its political neutrality toward the electoral parties, including the Socialist Party, French Syndicalism of the pre-war period was in reality a social-revolutionary party.

This revolutionary-syndicalist party has its revival in the C. S. R. which at present, however, is on the way to disintegration. It only has unity for criticizing the reformists of the Confederate rulership symbolized by Jouhaux. Its confusion in thought is great, in face of the new forms which the Russian Revolution gives to the problems of the future.

Old currents persist — new currents are forming. Most of the anarchists reject the dictatorship of the proletariat. The pure syndicalists are divided into two principal groups. First the Verdier group, attributing political and economic value only to Syndicalism, which, according to them, can become the sole real Communist Party after only a few changes in its organization. Then there is the Monatte group, constituting a Communist-Syndicalist Party, through still in opposition to the Communist Party. The Monatte group distrusts politicians — in which it is justified — and thinks that the co-existence of a Communist-Syndicalist Party with the C. P. is capable of exercising a beneficent influence on the latter. If I grasp Monatte's idea, it means that criticism coming from the outside, from a specifically workers' communist organization, will be more wholesome and effective for the Communist Party itself, than criticism made by Communist workers within the Party.

Nevertheless, the Monatte group recognizes the utility, and even the necessity of coordinating syndicalism's action with that of the Communist Party, for precise ends.

With regard to the Marseilles Congress. I believe that I shall have the opportunity of returning to these delicate and complex problems. The foreign comrades must realize that these problems come up under quite an original form in France.

I do not know if the Verdier group is determined to cleave inflexibly to its present position. That would be a great misfortune.

I know this — that between Monatte's Communist-Syndicalist Party and the Communist Party there are only misunderstandings arising from sentimental mistrust and petty disaccords of quite a secondary order. I hope that the lesson of Spain will be profitable to us, and that we in France will be spared from achieving revolutionary unity only in the far distant future and only driven thereto by bitter necessity.

Monatte's Communist-Syndicalist Party cannot reasonably expect to unite all the trade-union masses. It can only exercise its role of revolutionary and communist teacher on condition that it remains a doctrinal group within syndicalism.

The fusion with the Communist Party which I know is impossible immediately, and which I believe the future will render possible, will in no way violate the organic autonomy of the trade-unions.

For the present I want to consider Monatte's Communist-Syndicalist Party and the Communist Party as the two as yet separated halves of the real Communist Party of the future. Abandoning their timid attitude of being shame-faced communists and half-way syndicalists, the members of the Communist Party will try to win over the trade-unions to Communism. They will offer no offense thereby to the Com-

munist-Syndicalists, who follow Monatte's formula. In any case they have the right (and for them it is a question of dignity) to uphold their point of view against that of other syndicalist fractions. Besides, as long as it will be a question of overthrowing the reformists, the communists in the trade-unions can always be counted upon — the Party will keep up a most vigilant watch there.

But when Monatte's Communist-Syndicalist Party will have been fused with the Party, then Communism will really be able to lead forward the organized masses with an increased force toward new revolutionary victories which will enlarge and reinforce the initial victory of the Russian Revolution.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

Daszynski, the P. P. S. and Europe.

by Z. Leder (Warsaw).

Mr. Ignaz Daszynski is positively dissatisfied with Europe! "Our comrades (read: social-patriots of the same creed as Mr. Daszynski and his political friends, as well as the French, Italian and English socialists) have a curious conception of the Polish Socialist Party, of the Polish working-class and finally of Poland herself". This, at all events, Mr. Daszynski asserts in a leading article of the first number of a new "Propaganda Bulletin", which the Polish Socialist Party (P. P. S.) is distributing in the French language all over Europe.

It appears that all the above mentioned socialists are unjustly attacking, nay, even vilifying the P. P. S. At all events Mr. Daszynski loudly declares: "Nobody in the world has a right to treat my party with contempt or even to attack it". He especially emphasizes the fact that in summer 1920 when the Western European workers had to choose between Poland, the new "imperialist power", which in reality is but a miserable tool in the hands of imperialist France, and Soviet Russia, "Millions of workers boycotted Poland". This did because they believed that "they will serve the cause of the World Revolution by defending Bolshevik Russia and by preventing Poland from obtaining the necessary arms and munitions."

Thus the leader of the P. P. S., the late vice-president of the Polish council of ministers, is very much dissatisfied with the European socialists and workers. In his opinion they are misled by wrong information. Who then is responsible for this wrong information? Mr. Daszynski contends that this is due mainly to the fact that up till 1918 there was no Polish State and further, that this new state had to be established on the ruins of the three late Central European monarchies. Finally, the error of Europe with regard to the P. P. S. is attributed to the novelty of the thus created international situation. Therefore, Mr. Daszynski's party is trying to appeal to the "better informed" European socialists. He wishes: "to create for Socialist Europe a new service which will supply truthful information on the activity of the P. P. S."

Mr. Ignaz Daszynski pretends to be far more naive than one should expect of a party leader and a late vice-president of the Polish Council of Ministers.

It is not in consequence of wrong information that the conscious socialists look upon the P. P. S. "with contempt" or are attacking it. Therefore the friends of Mr. Daszynski will not succeed by means of a French bulletin in rehabilitating themselves in the eyes of the European workers. It is really not sufficient to assume the pose of a repentant sinner and to assure Europe that "the P. P. S. members are neither nationalists nor militarists, neither pro-Jews, nor anti-semites, neither heroes nor traitors". For these comical and pitiful words will by no means suffice to convince anybody. It is just as useless to assume the pose of a street corner artist and talk about "the immortal power of international solidarity". He who takes it upon himself to appeal to international solidarity must at all events *himself respect this solidarity*.

Now, what does Mr. Daszynski's party really represent in Poland? What is its place within the ranks of that Socialist International which has so miserably broken down under the weight of its treason to the socialist ideal? One has only to put those questions and to answer them in order to understand why the opinion of the socialist labour world is so unfavorable to Mr. Daszynski's party.

As Mr. Daszynski himself affirms, the P. P. S., before the war and during the whole twenty years of its existence, was striving only to gather the Polish workers under the banner

of the reestablishment of an independent Poland and to organize them for that purpose. It was an organization of "knights errant"—these are Mr. Daszynski's own words!—the sad heirs of the rebellious traditions of the lower nobility which misused the working-class in order to make them fight in the interests of an hostile class. This historical masquerade could be successful inasmuch as the oppression of the Poles by Tsarism and Kaiserism imbued the oppressed with a blind hatred against the oppressors which made the substance of the internal antagonisms between exploiters and exploited ones appear in the twilight of national antagonism.

The history of the P. P. S. before the war is consequently the history of the petty-bourgeois democratic leaders who were by all means fighting against the real working-class party—the latter was known then as the Social-Democratic party—in order to obtain the support of the working-class and to use the power of the workers for the realisation of nationalist aims.

Then there came the imperialist world war, which turned all Europe into a battlefield. For the P. P. S., this was however, a long-awaited welcome opportunity to embark upon its nationalist adventures. For this purpose it entered upon an alliance for life or death with Austro-German imperialism. It placed all its power at the service of Franz Joseph and Wilhelm II. Its real leader Pilsudski—Daszynski is, after all but his parliamentary hack—degraded himself to the part of a mercenary of the masters of imperialist Germany, the most terrible enemy of Polish nationalist aspirations! The Russian Revolution destroyed the basis of this perverse fraternity between Polish petty bourgeois nationalism and German imperialism. Pilsudski, so scandalously betrayed by German imperialism, for a moment turned his eyes towards revolutionary Russia, i. e., towards the petty-bourgeois democratic Russia of Kerenski, the only Russia with which he had something in common. For, being a violent Polish nationalist, he in his heart of hearts felt a keen hatred against Russia. For this venture he had to pay with imprisonment in Magdeburg fortress.

There was no real foundation for the activity of his party. The result of its twenty years' struggles seemed to be destroyed. However, the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the break down of the Central Powers and the so called German Revolution turned the P. P. S. and its leaders, which, meanwhile, had become the recognized leader of all petty-bourgeois and democratic nationalists, from vanquished again to victors. French imperialism, which for many decades took no interest whatsoever in the sufferings and aspirations of the Polish people, as it had bound itself up for good or evil with Russian Tsarism, now required an independent Poland as a barrier both against Soviet Russia and the conquered but still much feared Germany. Pilsudski now rapidly turned from a mercenary of the German Kaiser into a serf of French imperialism.

Pilsudski's party, the P. P. S., followed him faithfully all the time in his internal as well as in his foreign policy. During the three years of the existence of independent Poland there never was a stupidity committed by Polish reaction or Polish imperialism for which the P. P. S. was not responsible either by active supporting Pilsudski's policy or by its passive attitude. The imperialist war of robbery against Soviet Russia, the insurrection in Upper Silesia, the Lithuanian adventure, the militarist-nationalist rule in Poland itself with its barbarities against the communists, the financial breakdown of the Polish state—in all these crimes committed by the new-born Polish imperialism the P. P. S. has its share of responsibility. Without the support of the P. P. S., with its weak policy of compromise that knows only one aim, one ideal—a greater and more powerful Poland—these crimes would have been impossible. Let us not forget that the head of the first Polish cabinet was Moraczewski, an agent of Daszynski and a sergeant of "Marshal" Pilsudski. Has not the P. P. S. for months and months shared power with the bourgeoisie, forming with it a national coalition from the violent national-democrat Grabski to Daszynski, which in view of the "national emergency" raised the latter to the position of vice-president of the council of ministers? Has not the P. P. S., together with the bourgeois parties, assumed responsibility for the policy of the different Pilsudski cabinets by supporting them in Parliament either silently or openly carrying on at the same time a violent struggle against the communist "danger"? Has it ever ceased to denounce the communists to the Polish working-class as enemies of their own interests and of the Polish cause?

Mr. Daszynski declared that the P. P. S. consists neither of heroes nor of traitors. We quite agree that it does not consist of heroes, but there can be no doubt whatever that it

consist of real traitors! Traitors are they not that betray the same international solidarity to which they appeal daily in the interest of Polish imperialism? Traitors to the cause of the working-class whose interests they constantly sacrifice to so-called nationalist interests!

After three years, the P. P. S. stands lonely and discredited even in the Second International to which it is affiliated. The German social-democrats despise and abhor them because they, as agents of Polish imperialism, have assisted in cutting Upper Silesia from the "Vaterland". The English workers of the Labour Party regard them merely as supporters and servants of Pilsudski—the foe of the peace of Eastern Europe. Even the French social-patriots cannot understand how the Polish "socialists" can play the part of voluntary or involuntary allies of French imperialism, whose obnoxious rule embitters their life every day. Thus, after three years, the P. P. S. finds itself surrounded by such an atmosphere of open hostility that it has to leave the Second International without being able to join the 2½ International. The glowing patriots can now find no home in the socialist family.

Mr. Daszynski wails that the Polish mark is losing in value day by day. Consequently, he declares, the success of the P. P. S. propaganda must remain small and insufficient. In this we quite agree with him. Are Pilsudski's secret funds of the P. P. S. now empty or are they denied to the P. P. S.? We need not, however, bother here over these financial questions of Mr. Daszynski's party activities for the moral and political side of the matter is clear. But the P. P. S. desires to reconquer for itself sympathies in Europe. It has however no chance of attaining this object. *International solidarity is possible only between real internationalists. Nationalist and chauvinist parties which, like the P. P. S. are saturated with the poison of imperialism must necessarily remain isolated in the midst of their enemies.*

APPEALS OF THE EXECUTIVE

Against the Extradition of the Spanish Revolutionaries.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International has issued the following appeal.

"Workers, Comrades!

The German police, which is unable to find Kapp and Lüttwitz, and the murderers of Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Leo Jogisches, Sylt and Erzberger, has arrested, Luis Nicola Fort and Lucia Joaquina Concepcion, the alleged participants in the assassination of Premier Dato the Spanish mass-murderer of proletarians. The German reaction demands the extradition of the arrested comrades to the Spanish hangman-government. They want to secure the million pesetas which the murderous Spanish government has offered as reward for their extradition. The enormous profit to be made in the high foreign exchange value of the peseta as against the mark incited the raging reactionaries to various excesses even before the Spanish government had demanded their extradition. It is beyond the shadow of a doubt that both the accused, even if, as alleged, they are responsible for this assassination, did so for political reasons. The right of asylum is an institution of all nations which protects political criminals if they succeed in escaping the police of their own country. It is the duty of the German working class to see to it that under no circumstances are Fort and Concepcion delivered over to their executioners. Employ every means to influence the masses to put pressure on the government to refuse the extradition. Set the workers organized in the trade-unions and the social-democracy in motion, in order that they may constrain their leaders, members of the government, to prevent the extradition.

Workers of other countries! Join this action of the German proletariat against the extradition of the Spanish comrades who have avenged the oppressed Spanish proletariat.

The Spanish and the German counter-revolution is employing the assassination of Dato as an opportunity for commencing a brutal persecution of Spanish communists and syndicalists. Spanish communists have already been arrested in Berlin and Riga. The entire proletariat must thwart the extermination campaign of the Spanish counter-revolution. Unite in a mighty joint demonstration which will compel the German government to refuse to extradite the arrested comrades!

Executive Committee of the Communist International.